

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the title of the patent was objected to as not being descriptive. The title has been amended as suggested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12-14 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fenner et al. (U.S. 6,627,917). Anticipation requires that each and every element of a claim be found in a single prior art reference. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991).

I. Independent Claims 1, 7 and 12.

Independent claim 1 recites "a first pad positioned in a scribe lane adjacent the integrated circuit." Independent claim 7 recites "a plurality of pads positioned in the scribe lane . . . ." Independent claim 12 recites "a plurality of pads positioned in a scribe lane adjacent to the die edge . . . ." The requirement that a pad or plurality of pads be positioned in a scribe lane is in contrast with Fenner, which describes a plurality of pads 106a-106e located in the inactive region 104 of the wafer. (See FIG. 1). Fenner makes this distinction clear by stating "the wafer 100, as illustrated in FIG. 1, has an active region 102 and an inactive region 104. An array of dies 200 form the active region 102 while the inactive region 104, which extends partially around the periphery of the wafer 100, does not include any whole die portions . . . Scribe areas 105 separate each die 200 from those dies adjacent thereto . . . A series of conductive pads 106 are formed on a portion of the inactive region 104." (Col. 4, lines 7-18). Fenner makes clear that conductive pads 106 are not located in scribe areas 105, but rather in inactive region 104. Because Fenner does not teach a first pad or plurality of pads positioned in a scribe lane, Fenner does not teach each and every element of independent claims 1, 7 and 12 and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

## II. Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 recites “conductors providing connection between the fuse circuits and pads which are severed from the die subsequent to selective blowing of fuses of the fuse circuit.” In contrast, there is no conductor connecting fuse circuit 400 to conductive pads 106. Fenner states “in one embodiment, the apparatus 400 is configured as a fuse which blows after a predetermined amount of time . . . to ensure that the recorded time is accurate, the burn-in indicating apparatus 400 is preferably driven by on-board events.” Therefore, the fuse apparatus 400 in Fenner is not connected to conductive pads 106 by a conductor. Rather, fuse apparatus 400 is driven (blown) by components on die 200. This relationship is shown in FIG. 5, which shows fuse circuit 400 NOT connected to conductors 208, and therefore not conducted to conductive pads 106. Because Fenner does not teach conductors providing connection between the fuse circuits and pads, Fenner does not teach each and every element of independent claim 22 and the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.

## III. Dependent Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11 and 13-14

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11 and 13-14 were also rejected as unpatentable over Fenner. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from independent claim 1, claims 8-9 and 11 depend from independent claim 7, and claims 13-14 depend from independent claim 12. As such, these claims are allowable with their independent base claims. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the combinations of features recited in claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11 and 13-14 are patentable on their own merits, although this does not need to be specifically addressed herein since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fenner et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Lee (U.S. 4,935,645). For the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 and independent claim 7, Fenner does not teach each and every element

of claims 1 and 7. Because claims 4 and 10 depend from independent claims 1 and 7 respectively, these claims are allowable with their independent base claims. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the combinations of features recited in claims 4 and 10 are patentable on their own merits, although this does not need to be specifically addressed herein since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-14 and 22 are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 3/16/05

By: 

David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047

THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING

312 South Third Street

Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002

Telephone: (612) 339-1863

Fax: (612) 339-6580

DRF:MAC